

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Applicants have amended Figures 4 and 7 to delete reference numerals tr6A and tr6B.

Applicants have amended Figure 9 to delete reference numeral tr6A. The attached three (3) sheets of replacement drawings replace the original sheets of drawings having Figures 4, 7, and 9 thereon.

Attachments: Three (3) sheets of replacement drawings with Figures 4, 7, and 9 thereon.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-18 are pending in the subject application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 9, 11, and 13-18, and have canceled claims 2, 10, and 12. In addition, Applicants have made minor changes to the specification to correct typographical errors and have made minor changes to the drawings to delete certain reference numerals. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's prompt indication that claim 2 defines allowable subject matter. Applicants' responses to the issues raised in the Office Action are set forth in the following discussion.

In response to the objection to the drawings, Applicants have amended the drawings to address the numbering issues raised by the Examiner. The changes made to the drawings are described in detail in the "Amendments to the Drawings" section of this paper. In light of the changes made herein, Applicants submit that the drawings now comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) and request that the objection to the drawings thereunder be withdrawn.

In response to the objection to claims 6-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18, Applicants have amended the claims to address the deficiency cited by the Examiner. In particular, Applicants have amended the claims to specify that the daughter job is created as a copy of a mother job (or that the at least one daughter job is created as copies of a mother job). Applicants submit that claims 6-9, 11, 14, 15, 17 and 18 now comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a), and request that the objection to these claims thereunder be withdrawn.

### **Anticipation Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 9, 11, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hube* (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,316). As explained in more detail below, the *Hube* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in claims 9, 11, 14, and 17.

Considering first claim 9, the *Hube* reference discloses a print job processing technique that involves the use of a mother job and a daughter job. In this technique, the daughter job is used to produce prints while retaining the parent job. The *Hube* reference, however, does not disclose the creating of a daughter job from a mother job that is proof-printed, and the printing of the created daughter job. In the *Hube* system, as shown in Figure 11 and described in column 8, a copy of a parent job is first printed and then edited. The edited copy becomes a new parent, which means that a print job for “proof printing” cannot be a parent job. As a result, the *Hube* system never uses a “proof-printed” job itself as a parent job. Thus, for at least these reasons, the *Hube* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in claim 9.

Turning to claim 11, the *Hube* reference provides no disclosure of using a mother job or a daughter job to carry out proof printing and processing a print job that is not used for the proof printing. Instead, in the *Hube* system, copies of a job are always used to produce prints. Thus, for at least these reasons, the *Hube* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in claim 11.

Shifting to claims 14 and 17, these claims define a method and a recording medium, respectively, and each of these claims specifies features corresponding to those specified in apparatus claim 11. Thus, for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 11, the *Hube* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in claims 14 and 17.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 9, 11, 14, and 17 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Hube*.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 10, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Tang et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,629). As noted above, Applicants have canceled claim 10 and have amended claims 13 and 16. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 13 and 16 to define a method and a recording

medium, respectively. Each of claims 13 and 16 specifies subject matter that the Examiner indicated in the Office Action as being allowable over the prior art. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claims 13 and 16 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Tang et al.*

**Obviousness Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tang et al.* in view of International Standard ISO/IEC10175-1 (“the International Standard”) and in view of *Suzuki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,213,652 B1). Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the subject matter of original claim 2, which the Examiner indicated in the Office Action as being allowable over the prior art (in light of the changes to claim 1, Applicants have canceled claim 2). Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Tang et al.* in view of the International Standard and *Suzuki et al.* Claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Tang et al.* in view of the International Standard and *Suzuki et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tang et al.* in view of *Suzuki et al.* and further in view of *Takayanagi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,046,166). Claims 3 and 4 ultimately depend from claim 1, which, as discussed above, has been amended to include allowable subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claims 3 and 4 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Tang et al.* in view of *Suzuki et al.* and *Takayanagi et al.*

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 6, 7, 12, 15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* in view of *Tang et al.* (as

noted above, Applicants have canceled claim 12). As explained in more detail below, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Tang et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 6, 15, and 18.

Considering first claim 6, this claim defines a job management apparatus that includes a job creation module that creates at least one daughter job from a print job, to which a proof printing instruction is given, as copies of a mother job, a proof printing module that selects one among the mother job and the at least one daughter job as a proof print job and shifts the proof print job to a printable status while holding a residual print job, and a main printing module that shifts the residual print job to a printable status in response to input of a main printing instruction. There is no teaching or suggestion in the *Hube* reference of using a mother job or a daughter job to carry out proof printing and processing a print job that is not used for the proof printing. In contrast with the apparatus defined in claim 6, the *Hube* system always uses copies of a job for producing prints. The *Tang et al.* reference does not cure the foregoing deficiencies of the *Hube* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 6. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Tang et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in claim 6.

Turning to independent claims 15 and 18, these claims define a method and a recording medium, respectively, and each of these claims specifies features corresponding to those specified in apparatus claim 9. The deficiencies of the *Hube* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 9 are discussed above in connection with the anticipation rejection of claim 1 based on the *Hube* reference. The *Tang et al.* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Hube* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 9. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Tang et*

*al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in claims 15 and 18.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 6, 15, and 18 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hube* in view of *Tang et al.* Claim 7, which depends from claim 6, is likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hube* in view of *Tang et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 6.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* in view of *Suzuki et al.* and further in view of *Tang et al.* Claim 8 depends from independent claim 6. The deficiencies of the *Hube* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 6 are discussed above in connection with the obviousness rejection of claim 6. Neither the *Suzuki et al.* reference nor the *Tang et al.* reference cures the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Hube* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 6. Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hube* in view of *Suzuki et al.* and *Tang et al.* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 6.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-18, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due

U.S. Application No. 09/988,037  
Amendment dated February 6, 2006  
Response to Office Action dated October 4, 2005

in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP076).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "P. Martine", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Peter B. Martine  
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6900  
Customer No. 25920